



SCM /Tender Ref #:	DPME 06-2017/18
--------------------	-----------------

Request for proposals for:	Implementation Evaluation of the Learner Transport Programme	
Closing date and time:	28 July 2017, 12h00 @ 330 Grosvenor Street, Hatfield, Pretoria, with provision of 6 X hard copies of proposals; 1 X electronic version	
Compulsory briefing session:	Date: 13 July 2017	Time: 10:00
	Place: 330 Grosvenor Street, Hatfield, Pretoria	

Planned date of award of bid:	Expected project start date:	Expected project end date:
31 July 2017	14 August 2017	30 March 2018

1. BID INFORMATION

Information on the format and delivery of bids is contained in the attached bid documents. Please take note of the closing date and date of compulsory briefing session (if any).

2. PROPOSAL FORMAT

A detailed proposal in response to this ToR must be submitted. The proposal should contain all the information required to evaluate the bid against the requirements stipulated in this terms of reference. The following should be attached to the proposal as annexures

- **Annexure A:** Summary of past experience (Use attached template)
- **Annexure B:** Summary details of proposed team (Use attached template)
- **Annexure C:** Pricing information. Price proposals should include VAT and should be fully inclusive to deliver the outputs indicated in the terms of reference and must be submitted in a separate envelope.
- **Annexure D:** The published terms of reference (this document).
- **Annexure E:** All other forms / certificates required (see bid documents).

3. CONDITIONS OF BID

Detailed conditions applicable to all bids are contained in the bid documents accompanying this Terms of Reference. Only suppliers that meet all the requirements stipulated in the terms of reference and bid documents will be considered.

No late bids will be accepted. Only bids from service providers that attended the compulsory briefing session (if specified above) will be considered. Bids must be valid for a minimum period of 120 days after the closing date.

SCM Contact person	Name: Ziyanda Mtwá-Modupe Tel: 012 312 0416 e-mail: ziyanda@dpme.gov.za
--------------------	--

1. BACKGROUND/CONTEXT

- 1.1.** The right to basic education is embedded in terms of section 29 of the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa. In order to facilitate the realisation of this right, learners must be able to get to and from school. The ability of learners to access education is hampered by insufficient schools in areas where they live, resulting in long distances to get to school, as well as threats to their safety and security along the routes they travel, and the high costs of public transport. This results in some learners not attending school regularly. The following are the imperatives that underlie the implementation of the learner transport program. Section 85(2)(b) of the constitution mandates the Department of Transport to develop and implement transport policy. The provision of learner transport is critical in realizing government's outcome 1 of improved quality of basic education.
- 1.2.** Access to learner transport is a means to the attainment of Action Plan "Towards the Realization of Schooling 2025".
- 1.3.** Access to the nearest school has been and is still a challenge in the education system. According to SASA (South African School Act) the MEC (Member of the Executive Committee) must ensure that all learners have access to the nearest school, and where schools are far an alternative must be considered. Section 3 of the SASA, 1996 makes provision for a compulsory general education phase for learners from the age of seven until age of 15 of grade nine, whichever occurs first. Provincial MECs are responsible for ensuring that there are enough school places so that every child of eligible age can attend school and receive the compulsory general education and training. The National Policy for the Equitable Provision of an Enabling School Physical Teaching and Learner Environment of 2010 provides for the provision of alternatives where the provision of school infrastructure is not feasible. The policy provides alternatives including the provision of learner transport, hostels and special schools.
- 1.4.** Learner transport is one of an alternative solution to ensure that learners have access to education. In response to this situation, provincial education departments have attempted to address the problems of access to school through the provision of free learner transport. Initially the provincial Department of Education was responsible for the whole function, which is from planning to implementation. Challenges around contracting of service providers and the use of road-unworthy and no compliance became a challenge.
- 1.5.** In addressing this issue a decision was taken that the Department of Transport as the custodian of transport should form part in the provision of learner transport to ensure that learners are transported safely to and from schools in compliance with the norms and standards of road safety in terms of National Road Traffic Act of 1996 and National Land Transport Act of 2009.
- 1.6.** In order to deal with implementation challenges regarding learner transport, the Department of Transport in conjunction with the Department of Education developed the National Learner Transport Policy (NLTP). The NLTP was approved by Cabinet in 27 May 2015. Following the approval by Cabinet, the policy was published on the 23 October 2015 in the government gazette for implementation. The NLTP provides that national government will oversee the implementation of the policy in consultation with relevant stakeholders, including provinces, municipalities and School Governing Bodies (SGBs).

- 1.6.1.** NLTP (2015) section 3.3.1 outlines the following criteria for subsidized learner transport services:
- a. Learners from grade R to grade 12 with primary schools given a priority over secondary schools.
 - b. Learner transport is only subsidized to the nearest appropriate school only and not to a school of parental choice.
 - c. Learners with disabilities are given a priority.
- 1.7.** The National Learner Transport Programme (LTP) was developed in collaboration with the DBE with an aim of addressing challenges with access to education through the provision of learner transport. The programme aims to provide learners who have challenges in accessing schools within 3km radius of where they live with transport to the nearest available schools. The LTP has been in place for more than a decade and provides for the provision of subsidized transport to learners who walk more than five kilometers.
- 1.8.** The provision of learner transport has remained a shared responsibility of national and provincial Departments of Transport and Education. Learner transport implementation is a joint responsibility between the DOT and DBE. The Transport Sector manages the function in 5 provinces, namely: North West; Northern Cape; Mpumalanga; Eastern Cape and Free State. In 4 Provinces the Education Sector manages the function, namely: Gauteng; KwaZulu-Natal, Limpopo and Western Cape. The NLTP provides for an institutional framework through which LTP must be coordinated at the national and provincial level including the roles of each role players and stakeholders.
- 1.9.** In the 2016/17 financial year, a total of **465977** learners were transported against a total identified need of **524662** nationwide. The total budget in the 2016/17 financial year was over R 2.6 billion nationwide.
- 1.10.** Program performance varies from province to province and there is a lack of coordinated planning between the provincial Departments of Education and Transport. This alone calls for an urgent measure to be implemented aimed at improving performance, i.e. efficiency and effectiveness, of the subsidised LTP. This challenge has further been exacerbated by numerous factors that learners face on a daily basis ranging from road traffic accidents, the use of unproclaimed Light Delivery Vehicles (LDVs), bad road conditions, unroadworthy vehicles and overloading. Monitoring (mainly information management systems) and compliance were identified as key challenges currently faced by the LTP.
- 1.11.** The current learner funding model is not only heavily costing the government but is not sustainable. There are a large numbers of learners benefiting from the programme and the high cost hence the Standing Committee on Appropriations (SCOA) recommended that DPME in partnership with National Treasury, DBE, DOT, civil society and relevant stakeholders assess the efficacy of funding of learner transport to ensure that funds are used solely and exclusively for the intended purpose. It was decided that this be done through a comprehensive evaluation that will consider spending and implementation of the learner transport programme and explore options that allow for the ring fencing of funding allocated to learner transport in order.

2. PROBLEM STATEMENT / PURPOSE

The **purpose** of this *implementation evaluation* is to assess the implementation of the DBE/DOT Learner Transport Programme, with specific reference to the current patterns of its operational performance, results (delivery), and immediate outcomes.

The **focus of the evaluation** will be on current models of learner transport provision: how can we improve Learner Transport Programme performance, and use of resources?

Performance is to be assessed *relative* to the original programme goal(s), objectives and intended outcomes.

Key questions to be addressed

1. **(Relevance and Appropriateness):** To what extent is the design of the Learner Transport Programme appropriate, and consistent with education & transport sectors' priorities and policies, and partnerships with all key stakeholders?
2. **(Effectiveness):** To what extent has the implementation of the Learner Transport Programme been effective in achieving its goal(s), objectives and intended outcomes? What are the measureable results of the LTP in the period of review?
3. **(Efficiency):** To what extent has the implementation of the Learner Transport Programme been efficient, with specific regard to (i) organisational design and applied delivery model(s), (ii) core "business processes" used, (iii) management and administration, including record-keeping, and (iv) value-for-money?
4. **(Sustainability):** How sustainable is the Learner Transport Programme, considering the many competing priorities and demands in the education-transport sectors, and what is the medium-to-long-term prognosis of the learner transport challenge posed to Government? Are there viable alternatives to the current LTP programme intervention?
5. **(Impact):** What are the signs of emerging impact of the Learner Transport Programme, if any?
6. **(Recommendations):** On the basis of the answers to the preceding questions, what needs to be done to improve the implementation of the Learner Transport Programme and which aspects of the LTP need to be reviewed in detail?

Supporting Questions to guide evaluation enquiry:

1. **(Relevance and Appropriateness):** Key question: To what extent is the design of the Learner Transport Programme appropriate, and consistent with education & transport sectors' priorities and policies, and partnerships with all key stakeholders?
 - 1.1. **Programme Preparation:** Was there adequate preparation of the Learner Transport Programme?
 - 1.1.1. At inception, what studies (if any) were used to inform the LTP? Was there appropriate quality research used to inform programme design?
 - 1.1.2. What process/data/information was used to inform the placement of the learner transport function?
 - 1.1.3. What options were considered?

- 1.1.4. Did provincial LT programmes adequately identify the need or plan to do so?
 - 1.2. **Conceptual Design:** Is the conceptual design of the LTP relevant and appropriate in terms of national priorities, education and transport sectors' context and policy, and institutional environments?
 - 1.3. Is the LTP conceptually clear, and coherent? Are the appropriate key performance indicators being used for monitoring and management purposes and/or are these technically sound?
 - 1.4. What is the underlying Theory of Change (TOC) of the programme?
 - 1.5. Does the programme have a logframe, and does it comply with standards for technical good practice? If a programme logframe does not exist, the service provider is expected to produce one.
 - 1.6. **Ownership and Participation:** To what extent was there effective consultation with all key stakeholder institutions and role-players in the conceptualization, design and planning of the LTP, including National Treasury, Department of Transport, Department of Basic Education (especially provincial departments as well), municipalities, private operators and community-based organisations?
 - 1.7. Are the programme eligibility criteria appropriate in terms of beneficiaries' priorities?
 - 1.8. Is the learner transport policy relevant, appropriate and understood by key stakeholders?
2. **(Effectiveness):** Key question: Within the approved programme results framework, to what extent has the implementation of the Learner Transport Programme been effective in achieving its goal(s), objectives and intended outcomes? What are the measureable results of the LTP in the period of review (2011-2016)?
- 2.1. **Programme Performance.** What is the Learner Transport Programme's performance (relative to its agreed results framework) in the period of review? (To answer this subsequent sections in the report may first have to be completed)
 - 2.1.1. What are the main activities undertaken by the LT programme? To what extent were they aligned with programme's (developed) Theory of Change and Logical Framework?
 - 2.1.2. What are the main programme outputs produced, associated with the activities identified and described in 2.1.1 above?
 - 2.1.3. What are the main *immediate* programme outcomes, and *intermediate* outcomes (if possible) associated with the activities identified and described in 2.2.2. above?
 - 2.1.4. To what extent is learner transport provided by the LT Programme (i) reliable (on time), (ii) safe (road safety), and (iii) secure? Provide a provincial breakdown, relative to national and provincial policy?
 - 2.2. **Implementation Effectiveness.** Has the programme been implemented as planned, relative to the need?
 - 2.2.1. Interrogate the key performance indicators of the LT Programme: identify them; are they appropriate? Are they technically sound? What are the associated targets that have been set (per province)? What has the performance of the LT programme been relative to its own current performance indicators?
 - 2.2.2. To what extent has the specific programme elements (in the results framework) been effective individually, and to what extent has the LT programme been effective overall?
 - 2.3. **Stakeholder Feedback:** what are stakeholder groups' views on the Programme, and do these vary for various stakeholder groups or beneficiaries?
 - 2.3.1. What are the stakeholder groups' recommendations on interventions required to improve the implementation of the LTP per province?
 - 2.3.2. What are the main lessons identifiable regarding the implementation of the LTP?
 - 2.3.3. What recommendations does the study offer to improve the implementation of the LTP?

2.3.4. Which aspects of the LTP need to be reviewed? If so, why?

3. **(Efficiency):** To what extent has the implementation of the Learner Transport Programme been efficient, with specific regard to (i) organisational design and applied delivery model(s), (ii) core “business processes”¹ used, (iii) management and administration, including record-keeping, and (iv) value-for-money? Do schools submit lists of learners timeously and correctly?

3.1. **Organisational Design and Delivery Models:**

3.1.1. Identify and do a short write-up of the organisational design and delivery model for each of the provinces.

3.1.2. Does the required data exist to establish eligibility? Are the eligibility criteria appropriate and correctly applied?

3.1.3. Is there adequate capacity to plan, and run the programme? (Human, financial, systems, technology, management). Make province-specific.

3.1.4. Prepare a process narrative (write-up) of the Learner Transport Programme in the period of review. Describe how the LTP was set up operationally, the main role-players/stakeholders, and the general process of programme implementation (delivery). Note the differences between provinces and coordination/management processes at national level.

3.1.5. To what extent was policy oversight from the Standing Committee on Accounts (Parliament) effective? What was its effect on LTP management and operations?

3.1.6. What changes to policy, institutional arrangements or eligibility criteria could be recommended?

3.2. **Management, Administration (including Procurement), and Oversight:**

3.2.1. At national level, how does the NWC manage and coordinate provincial organisation and delivery of the Learner Transport Programme? Is there an effective “national delivery model for the LT programme? What are current strengths and weaknesses in this area?

3.2.2. What is the current state of provincial management and administration of the LTP? Describe in detail in terms of oversight, management and administration: policies, structures, systems (including technology), processes and procedures.

3.2.3. To what extent is the process of identifying and contracting operators occurring in accordance with relevant procurement policy? What are the specific requirements for operators (drivers)?

3.2.4. What are the specified vehicle requirements (by provinces) with regards to ensuring the use of safe and roadworthy vehicles in the LTP, given road conditions? Are these appropriate and/or adequate in terms of transport policy?

3.2.5. To what extent are the legal agreements (SLAs) entered into with operators managed effectively by LTP managers in the provinces? Is there effective monitoring of contract-management (of operators) by the NWC?

3.2.6. Are learners abiding by their respective codes of conduct?

3.2.7. How well is departmental monitoring of service providers and other programme and processes working? To what extent (i) can the data be considered reliable, (ii) is the integrity of data systems upheld (risks and controls), and (iii) is record-keeping in line with accepted administrative standards in Government?

3.2.8. *Leadership and Communication:* Are all stakeholders/role-players adequately informed about the LTP? Outline the formal communication structures, processes and communication flow in the LTP. Do schools and parents receive clear communication

¹ Also referred to “programme elements” in NT performance expenditure reviews
DPME DBE/DOT TORs

of the final lists of beneficiaries?

3.3. Core Business Processes/Programme Elements:

3.3.1. To what extent do the distinct LT programme elements (in the results framework) work together efficiently? What are the main strengths and weaknesses (“blockages”) in the process flow of programme implementation?

3.3.2. What is the average length of the trip? Make province-specific.

3.3.3. To what extent do provincial LT programmes adequately identify the learner transport need? To what extent does routine LT planning in provinces address the identified need?

3.3.4. Are authorised routes planned in a way that is consistent and cost-effective?

3.4. Value-for-Money:

3.4.1. How much is being spent on the Learner Transport Programme? Per province? Per learner? What is the current coverage of the LTP per kilometre?

3.4.2. Are there significant differences across provinces? What are the provincial funding trends of the LTP? Provide a detailed comparison of provincial models for the provision of learner transport across the country, including Mpumalanga Province which has a Public Private Partnership (PPP).

3.4.3. What are the cost implications relative to alternative ways of addressing distance from school (e.g. hostels, more schools)?

3.4.4. Is pricing based on regulated competition for a route? Are pricing models used to cost learner transport provision (in accepted operator bids) reasonable and market-related?

3.4.5. What do departments do to apply a consistent and fair method to prioritise coverage during budget (re)prioritisation? What are the current approaches to (re)prioritisation?

3.4.6. To what extent is there duplication in spending with regard to LTP?

3.5. To what extent would the development of norms and standards for the LTP be appropriate?

4. **(Sustainability):** How sustainable is the Learner Transport Programme, considering the many competing priorities and demands in the education-transport sectors, and what is the medium-to-long-term prognosis of the learner transport challenge posed to Government? Are there viable alternatives to the current LTP programme intervention?

4.1. What is the economic relationship between increasing LT versus increasing spending in infrastructure building?

4.2. Based on the efficiency assessment undertaken (under key question 3), what is the most efficient funding model and funding mechanism(s) for the funding of the LTP?

4.3. Will provinces be able to continue funding at current commitment levels?

4.4. To what extent does current funding satisfy the current need?

4.5. Should funding be protected for the learner transport programme (‘ring-fenced’)?

4.6. What is the difference between rural and urban areas with regards to viability? Are the most economically efficient options in rural and urban areas being selected as far as LT is concerned? (include specific areas)

4.7. Are there comparable international trends in terms of learner transport provision? To what extent can these be applied in South Africa? Provide a detailed response.

5. **(Impact):** What is the emerging impact of the Learner Transport Programme, if any?

5.1. What are stakeholders’ perceptions and indications of emerging impact of the LTP, if any?

5.2. Are there unintended consequences of the LTP? If so, please provide details.

6. (**Recommendations**): On the basis of the answers to the preceding questions, what needs to be done to improve the implementation of the Learner Transport Programme and which aspects of the LTP need to be reviewed in detail?
- 6.1. Besides the specific recommendations identified, what are the key overall recommendations (4 or 5) regarding the LTP?
- 6.1.1. Is learner transport an effective policy mechanism to address the specific access to education challenge currently addressed by the programme? If not, what should be considered?
- 6.1.2. What are the budget implications of the overall and/or specific recommendations, if any?

3. OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE OF PROJECT

The **purpose** of this *implementation evaluation* is to assess the implementation of the DBE/DoT Learner Transport Programme, with specific reference to the current patterns of its operational performance, results (delivery), and immediate outcomes.

The evaluation will encompass the mandate and reach of the Learner Transport Implementation Programme. The data will be reviewed from 2012/13 to 2016/17 financial years.

3.1 Themes to be covered

- 3.1.1 Design, definitional and conceptual issues
- 3.1.2 Roles and responsibilities, institutional arrangements
- 3.1.3 Quality of Services and Programme Performance Monitoring system
- 3.1.4 Capacity to implement and Procurement Processes
- 3.1.4 Cost Efficacy, funding model, sufficiency of funding and sustainability

NB: These are minimum themes and the service provider is not limited to these.

3.2 Geographic coverage

- The evaluation has both a national, provincial and local level focus.

3.3 Evaluation Plan

Products/deliverables expected from the evaluation

The core products expected from the evaluation are the following:

- 3.3.1 **Inception Report** by the service provider as a follow-up to the proposal with a revised evaluation plan, evaluation design and methodology.
- 3.3.2 Current **Theory of Change and Logical Framework** for the intervention if this does not already exist (using the DPME Guideline on Planning of New Implementation Programmes). The evaluation should test this theory of change and then at the end make suggestions for changes.
- 3.3.3 4 Monthly progress reports (short).
- 3.3.4 **Literature review** (including learner programme documentation²) which draws on analysis

² Including plans, organisational reports, guidelines and protocols, and other reports pertaining to the Learner Transport DPME DBE/DOT TORs

of policies and related regulations that govern Learner Transport Program review of both grey and published literature on the learner transport programme and its implementation, and provides the evidence base for the evaluation analysis and findings.

- 3.3.5 **Report structure** (drawing from the literature review and evaluation questions), **analytical framework**, final **data collection instruments** and other tools.
- 3.3.6 **Field work report**
- 3.3.7 **Draft evaluation report** for review, comprehensive and in 1/5/25 format (see Action Points);
- 3.3.8 **Workshop with stakeholders** to validate and discuss the draft report.
- 3.3.9 **Revised draft evaluation report** based on stakeholder feedback (full and in 1/5/25 format), including written feedback from the DOT/DBE, and the DPME.
- 3.3.10 The **final evaluation report**, both full and in 1/5/25 format, in hard copy and electronic;
- 3.3.11 A revised theory of change and proposed recommendations. This should be part of the final report.
- 3.3.12 Provision of all electronic **datasets, metadata and survey documentation** (including interviews) when data is collected.
- 3.3.13 A Power-point or audio-visual **presentation of the results**.

3.4 Potential Users

User	Potential Use of Evaluation results
Parliament	Inform decision making with regards to efficiency, sustainability, appropriate use of resources
National Treasury	Inform budgeting in terms of MTSF
Department of Basic Education (provinces and districts)	Informed by the constitution in terms of access. Policy implementation and programme performance within the DBE across national and provincial spheres-implementing department
Department of Transport	Policy implementation and programme performance with the DOT across national and provincial spheres-implementing department
Schools	Monitoring of the programme efficiency and learner attendance.
Communities	Hold government to account in terms of access to basic education.
Non-Governmental Organizations/Civil Societies Organisations	Hold government to account in terms of access to basic education
Academics	Knowledge awareness and improvement and improvement of community practice
Municipalities	Enforce safety regulations around learner transport and ensure roads are worthy.
Organised labour	Hold government to account in terms of access to basic education.
Operators	Improve efficient delivery of the programme.

The service provider is expected to attend the following meeting engagements as a minimum:

- 4 Participation in an inception workshop with the Steering Committee to develop a focused and detailed methodology to address key sub-questions. The Service Provider will be expected to revise the proposal following the inception workshop (if applicable) and prepare an inception report.
- 5 Facilitation of a workshop with stakeholders on the theory of change to be used and the development of a log-frame.
- 6 Presentation of initial findings, analysis and recommendations to a stakeholder validation workshop. The Service Provider will utilise the feedback from the workshop to finalise the report and its recommendations.

4. PROPOSED METHODOLOGY / APPROACH

The prospective service provider should propose an appropriate methodology to respond to the evaluation questions in section 2 above. The evaluator is expected to use both qualitative and quantitative methods to respond to the evaluation questions. Amongst others, the approach should include the following:

4.1 Document Review

Document review will include, at least: (1) Analysis of the Learner Transport Program and related policies and regulations, as well as plans, organisational reports, conventions, guidelines and protocols, moderation reports and other reports pertaining to the Learner Transport Programme (2) Review of both grey and published literature on the Learner Transport Programme and its implementation. (3) Reports generated from its Database. (4) National Household Travel Survey (SSA-2013) (5) National Income Dynamics Data (NIDS).

Some of these documents include:

- (1) Department of Transport. 1996. National Road Traffic Act, (Act No. 93 of 1996) Government Printers. Pretoria.
- (2) Department of Transport. National Learner Transport Policy, 2015
- (3) Department of Basic Education, National Policy for the Equitable Provision of enabling school physical teaching and learning environment (2010)
- (4) Provincial Transport Policies-various
- (5) Republic of South Africa.1996a. Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, 1996 (Act No.27 of 1996)
- (6) Republic of South Africa, 1996b.National Education Policy Act, 1996 (Act No.27 of 1996)
- (7) Republic of South Africa.1996c. South Africa Schools Act, 1996 (Act No. 84 of 1996)
- (8) Republic of South Africa.2010. National Development Plan, 2030. Government Printers.
- (9) Provincial Land Transport Frameworks

The DOT, DBE and critical stakeholder institutions will provide access to relevant Learner Transport data to the appointed consulting team.

Other source documents and literature will be sourced by the Service Provider, with the support of the DOT and DBE liaison persons.

4.2 Interviews and Focus groups

Based on a good representative sample of the relevant stakeholder populations, conduct a

number of face-to-face interviews, and focus groups with a range of stakeholders, focused on the Learner transport and its implementation. The methodology **MAY INCLUDE** (subject to review and confirmation at the inception meeting and steering committee approval):

4.2.1. Undertake interviews/roundtables with the following stakeholders:

- 1) National and Provincial Transport Departments
- 2) National and Provincial Basic Education Department
- 3) Schools, urban and rural, School Governing Bodies (SGBs), farm schools, and special schools
- 4) Operators, urban and rural, bus companies and (SANTACO)
- 5) Other bodies and sector experts and or institutions including CSDS, and interest groups

4.2.2 Undertake a Survey directed to collect data from stakeholders.

4.2.3 Undertake a high-level assessment of information systems supporting the learner transport system.

4.2.4 Prepare an analysis plan, using the indicators identified for the evaluation.

4.3. Qualitative and quantitative analysis

Use qualitative and quantitative analysis across the thematic areas where possible, and on the extent to which key systems are being implemented across the Learner transport. Sampling is to be used in line with accepted good practice, and detailed in the evaluation proposal.

4.4 Learning processes

Reflective processes with interviewees, a stakeholder validation workshop to reflect on the lessons (including on the design and process), emerging findings and how the planning wide system can be strengthened.

4.5 Learner Transport theory of change and logical framework

Review the initial theory of change and logic model of the Learner transport system and propose recommendations for improvement and/or review.

Recommendations should be specific and practical, bearing in mind that an improvement plan will be developed following the evaluation.

5. DELIVERABLES AND TIME FRAMES

The evaluation timeframe is 5 months including non-billable time (e.g. feedback preparation by officials). Typically, evaluations can take **12 months** to complete, including delays. The indicative evaluation schedule below runs from **14 August 2017** to **30 March 2018**.

5.Deliverable	Expected Date	% of project payment
1. Indicative Start Date and Inception Briefing Meeting	14 August 2017	
2. Inception report submission	18 August 2017	
3. Approved Inception Report	25 August 2017	10%
4. Service Provider contract signed	1 September 2017	
5. Submission of literature review including International Comparative Study	15 September 2017	10%
6. Approved report structure, analytical framework, final data collection instruments and piloting of instruments.	13 October 2017	10%
7. Submission of fieldwork report (to be presented at Stakeholder Validation workshop)	8 December 2017	
8. Stakeholder Validation Workshop to discuss the draft report (summary slides)	26 January 2018	10%
9. Submission of First Draft Comprehensive Evaluation Report	16 February 2018	30%
10. Submission of Draft 2 Report full and draft 1/5/25 report incorporating inputs from the workshop	9 March 2018	10%
11. Submission of the Final Draft 3 Report full and draft 2 1/5/25 report	23 March 2018	
12. Approval of final evaluation reports (approval by Steering Committee)	30 March 2018	20%
13. Presentation of the report to centre of Government departments	April 2018	
14. Power-point or audio-visual presentation of the results and provision of all datasets, metadata and survey documentation (including interview transcripts).	30 March 2018	

6. EXPERIENCE / SKILLS / TEAM COMPOSITION REQUIRED

The attached templates must be used to summarise qualifications, skills and past experience.

6.1. Experience required (Bidder to ensure it meets the minimum functional evaluation criteria stipulated)

Bidders will demonstrate adequate experience through the number, types and geographical spread of projects/assignments undertaken. The attached template must be used to summarise experience. The proposal should contain letters of reference, CVs of proposed team members or other means of verifying past experience. The team leader must have at least 15 years of experience including working with government at a senior level, and with complex evaluations. He/she may well be an expert in public sector reform, planning or M&E. He/she must be an expert in service delivery improvements plans.

6.2. Competencies / Skills required (Bidder to ensure it meets the minimum functional evaluation criteria stipulated)

The specific assignment and field of work requires the following skills set:

The competencies for evaluation are summarised from the Evaluation Competencies available on the DPME website. The service provider will be assessed against some of these competencies (see 8.4.2):

Domain/descriptor	Demonstrated ability to
1 Overarching considerations	
1.1 Contextual knowledge and understanding	Have knowledge of relevant sectors and government systems in relation to the 15 priority outcomes and can appropriately relate the evaluation to current political, policy and governance environments. Have knowledge of education and learner transport policies, systems and transport planning and implementation.
1.2 Ethical conduct	Understand ethical issues relating to evaluation, including potential or actual conflict of interest, protecting confidentiality/anonymity, and obtaining informed consent from evaluation participants.
1.3 Interpersonal skills	Lead an evaluation and its processes using facilitation and learning approaches, to promote commitment and ownership of stakeholders
2 Evaluation leadership	
2.1 Project management	Lead and manage an evaluation team effectively and efficiently, and manage the project effectively to completion in a way which delivers high quality evaluations and builds trust of stakeholders.

TERMS OF REFERENCE

Domain/descriptor	Demonstrated ability to
2.2 Composition of the team	Strong project manager, evaluation specialist, and sector specialist (not necessarily three people) as well as other relevant team members for the specific assignment.
2.3 Involvement of PDIs	At least 40% of team are Previously Disadvantaged Individuals (PDIs) ³ and they must play a meaningful role in the evaluation (shown in the activity table)
2.4 Capacity development	Meaningful capacity development to departmental staff as agreed with the relevant departments
3 Evaluation craft	
3.1 Evaluative discipline and practice	Use knowledge base of evaluation (theories, models including logic and theory based models, types, methods and tools), critical thinking, analytical and synthesis skills relevant to the evaluation, and use evidence appropriately to inform findings and recommendations.
3.2 Research practice	Design specific research methods and tools that address the evaluation's research needs. This may include qualitative, quantitative or mixed methods.
	Systematically gather, analyse, and synthesise relevant evidence, data and information from a range of sources, identifying relevant material, assessing its quality, spotting gaps, and drawing appropriate findings and recommendations.
4 Implementation of evaluation	
4.1 Evaluation planning	
Theory of change	Develop clear theory of change with quality programme log frames with good programme logic and indicators.
Design	Design and cost an appropriate and feasible evaluation with appropriate questions and methods, based on the evaluation's purpose and objectives.
4.2 Managing evaluation	Manage evaluation resources to deliver high quality evaluations and related objectives on time and to appropriate standards.
4.3 Report writing and communication	Write clear, concise and focused reports that are credible, useful and actionable, address the key evaluation questions, and show the evidence, analysis, synthesis, recommendations and evaluative interpretation and how these build from each other.
Total	

Furthermore, it is important that service providers nominated exhibit the following skills and attributes:

- Are team players and analytical and lateral thinkers;
- Have excellent communication skills with the ability to listen and learn;
- Have good facilitation skills for strategic thinking, problem solving, and stakeholder

³ By PDIs we mean the designated groups Black, Indian, and Coloured individuals. For example, if a team consists of 10 members, 4 of them should be PDIs.

management in complex situations;

- Have the ability to work under consistent and continuous pressure from varied sources, yet be able to maintain a supportive approach; and have excellent computing skills including detailed knowledge and use of: Word, Excel, Power Point, Microsoft Project or similar compatible software

6.3. Minimum qualifications required (Bidder to ensure it meets the minimum functional evaluation criteria stipulated)

All research-related professional services will require a minimum of a Master's degree from the individual if a short term assignment is undertaken or from the team leader for longer term research projects. Copies of qualifications must be included in the proposal. DPME reserves the right to verify all qualifications through the South African Qualifications Authority.

6.4. Team composition (Bidder to ensure it meets the minimum functional evaluation criteria stipulated)

The service provider should specify the number of evaluators expected to be part of the team, their areas of expertise and their respective responsibilities. **Inclusion of Transport Specialists with proven experience is a requirement** in this evaluation. The team must possess relevant qualification(s), including at least a Postgraduate Degree. At least 40% of team should be Previously Disadvantaged Individuals (PDI) and these individuals must play a meaningful role in the project. The Steering Committee may elect to propose to the successful bidder inclusion of an appropriate international expert should this be deemed to be necessary to meet the requirements for this assignment.

The team contained in the proposal must be available for the duration of the project. Replacement of team members may only be done in consultation with DPME and replacement team members must have at least the same qualifications / skills / experience as those they are replacing.

6.5. Project management

The evaluation will be managed through a Project Steering Committee that will be established. The project steering committee will be convened by the National Department of Transport in conjunction with the Department of Basic Education. The committee will be further comprised of National Treasury, Provinces, Department of Planning and Monitoring.

6.5.1. Role of steering committee

A Steering Committee has been established comprising DPME, DBE, DOT, NT and other key stakeholders, which will be responsible for overseeing the whole evaluation including approving the inception report and other main deliverables. Refer to the DPME Guideline on TORs for Steering Committees on the DPME website for more detail.

6.5.2. Peer reviewers

National and international peer reviewers will be contracted to support the assignment. Refer to the DPME Guideline on Peer Reviewers on DPME website for more detail.

6.5.3. Reporting arrangements

The evaluation project manager to whom the service provider will report is Mr Antonio Hercules, Director: Evaluation, DPME. Contact details: Antonio@dpme.gov.za; 012 312 0164.

7. COSTING METHODOLOGY

Prices must be inclusive of VAT (if VAT registered) and must address all deliverables indicated in this ToR.

8. EVALUATION OF BIDS

8.1. Administrative requirements

Only bids / quotes that comply with all administrative requirements and that submitted all required bid documents (acceptable bids) will be considered during the functional evaluation phase. Only acceptable bids / quotes will be scored by the Bid Evaluation Committee against the functional criteria indicated in this Terms of Reference.

8.2. Functional evaluation Part 1 (Mandatory requirements)

Criteria		Yes	No
1	Project team leader has at least a Master’s degree		
2	Project team has 15 years’ experience		

Only bids that meet all administrative requirements and all the mandatory requirements indicated above (if any) will be evaluated using the functional evaluation criteria indicated below (functional evaluation part 2).

8.3. Functional evaluation Part 2

Weight allocation	Scoring system
1 – Value adding requirement (minimum score of 2)	1– Does not comply with the requirements
3 – Important requirement (minimum score of 6 or 9)	2– Partial compliance with requirements
5 – Essential requirement / integral part of project (minimum score of 15)	3 – Full compliance with requirements
	4 – Exceeds requirements

TERMS OF REFERENCE

Functional Evaluation Criteria		Weight	Score	Weight X Score	Min. Score
1	<p>Experience (par 6.1 of ToR): Demonstrated experience of undertaking similar projects</p> <p>1= No evidence that bidder has undertaken similar projects.</p> <p>2= Bidder has successfully undertaken 1 or 2 similar projects</p> <p>3= Bidder has successfully undertaken 3 or 4 similar projects</p> <p>4= Bidder has successfully undertaken 5 or more similar projects</p>	5			15
2	<p>Skills (par 6.2 of ToR):</p> <p>1= The proposed team does not meet the skills requirement.</p> <p>2= The proposed team meets some of the skills requirements</p> <p>3= The proposed team meets all of the skills requirements.</p> <p>4= The proposed team exceeds the skills requirements</p>	3			9
3	<p>Qualifications: (par 6.3 of ToR):</p> <p>1= The proposed team does not meet any of the qualifications requirements.</p> <p>2= The proposed team meets at least half but not all the qualifications requirements.</p> <p>3= The proposed team meets all the qualifications requirements</p> <p>4= The proposed team exceeds the qualifications requirements</p>	3			6
4	<p>Team composition (par 6.4 of ToR): At least 30% of team are Previously Disadvantaged Individuals (PDIs)⁴ and they must play a meaningful role in the project:</p> <p>1= Team consists of less than 40% PDIs <u>and</u> less than 30% of person-days allocated to PDIs.</p> <p>2= Team consists of less than 40% PDIs <u>or</u> less than 30% of person-days allocated to PDIs.</p> <p>3= Team consists of at least 40% PDIs and at least 40% of person-days allocated to PDIs.</p> <p>4= Team consists of at least 40% PDIs, at least 40% of person-days allocated to PDIs, and one of the specialists / team leaders is PDI.</p>	5			15

⁴ By PDIs we mean Blacks, Indians, and Coloureds. For example, if a team consists of 10 members, 4 of them should be PDIs.

TERMS OF REFERENCE

Functional Evaluation Criteria		Weight	Score	Weight X Score	Min. Score
5	<p>Knowledge of and exposure to international good practice, particularly in middle-income and African countries.</p> <p>1= No international experience available</p> <p>2= Proposal makes mention of international experience but not convincing in how this will benefit the project</p> <p>3= Organisation has undertaken international work and shows in the proposal how it will draw in international experience and insight</p> <p>4= Recognised international expertise included in the team (either sector or evaluation)</p>	1			2
6	<p>Extent to which the methodology is realistic given the scope and time frames of the project:</p> <p>1= The evaluation methodology is <u>not aligned</u> to the scope and times frames of the project</p> <p>2= The evaluation methodology is <u>not entirely aligned</u> to scope and time frames and may negatively impact delivery.</p> <p>3= The evaluation methodology is realistic given the scope and time frames of the project.</p> <p>4= The evaluation methodology is realistic and provides innovative solutions.</p>	3			9
TOTAL					

Minimum functional requirements: Bids and that scored at least the minimum for each element as well as the overall minimum score (75%), based on the average of scores awarded by the Bid Evaluation Committee members.

8.4. PRICE / BBEE / PPPFA

Only bids that meet the minimum administrative and functional requirements / specifications indicated in the ToR will be evaluated in terms of the Preferential Procurement Framework Act and related regulations – see attached bid documents.

9. SPECIAL CONDITIONS APPLICABLE TO THIS BID

9.1. Awarding of the final contract will be subject to the conclusion of Service Level Agreement between the DPME and successful service providers.

10. GENERAL**10.1. The Service Provider undertakes to:**

- 10.1.1. Conduct business in a courteous and professional manner.
- 10.1.2. Provide the necessary documentation as requested prior to the awarding of the contract.
- 10.1.3. Comply with all relevant employment legislation and applicable bargaining council agreements, including UIF, PAYE, etc. DPME may monitor compliance for the duration of the contract and implement penalties for non-compliance.
- 10.1.4. Manage internal disputes among his/her staff in such a way that DPME is not affected by those disputes.
- 10.1.5. Comply with the DPME security and emergency policies, procedures and regulations at DPME premises.
- 10.1.6. Ensure that all work performed and all equipment used at DPME facilities are in compliance with the Occupational Health and Safety Act, 1993 (Act no. 85 of 1993) and any regulations promulgated in terms of this Act and the standard instructions of DPME;
- 10.1.7. Ensure that all staff working on this project are adequately trained prior to the commencement of the project.
- 10.1.8. Ensure that DPME is informed of any changes in staff related to the execution of the project. For security reasons, DPME reserves the right to vet all persons working on this project.
- 10.1.9. Undertakes to store and handover all data generated by the project to DPME in an accessible and confidential manner.

10.2. DPME undertakes to:

- 10.2.1. Manage the contract in a professional manner.
- 10.2.2. Provide appropriate information as and when required and only in situations where it is required by the service provider to fulfil their duties.
- 10.2.3. Not accept any responsibility for any damages suffered by the service provider or their staff for the duration of the project.
- 10.2.4. Not tolerate any unfair labour practices between the service provider and their staff that happen during the execution of the project activities.
- 10.2.5. Not accept any responsibility for accounts/expenses incurred by the service provider that was not agreed upon by the contracting parties.

TERMS OF REFERENCE

ANNEXURE A: SUMMARY OF PAST EXPERIENCE (Attach reference letters or other means of verification)					
Project description	Client name	Client contact name, number, e-mail address	Contract start date	Contract end date	Contract value

TERMS OF REFERENCE

ANNEXURE B: DETAILS OF PROPOSED TEAM (Attach copies of qualifications)						
Name	Role	Qualifications	Experience	Race	Gender	Days allocated to this project

TERMS OF REFERENCE

ANNEXURE C1: COSTING OF GOODS (Leave blank if not required)				
Description	# of units	Unit cost (VAT incl.)	Total cost (VAT Incl.)	Lead time (Days)
TOTAL C1				

ANNEXURE C2: COSTING OF SERVICES (Deliverable dates based on expected project start date indicated on page 1 of the ToR)		
Description of deliverable	Completion date	Cost (VAT incl.)
TOTAL C2		

TOTAL BID PRICE (C1 + C2) incl. VAT Please ensure that this price matches the price indicated on SBD 1	R
--	---

ANNEXURE C3: OTHER DISBURSEMENTS (Time and Material costs not included in total bid price)	
Description of other disbursement	Cost (VAT incl.)



The term "Bid" Includes price quotations, advertised competitive bids, limited bids and proposals.

Document	Check Bidder	Verified SCM Unit
Invitation to bid (SBD 1)		
Declaration of interest (SBD 4)		
Preference Points Claim (SBD 6.1)		
Declaration of past supply chain management practices (SBD 8)		
Certificate of Independent Bid Determination (SBD 9)		
Valid B-BBEE Status Level Verification Certificate (Original or Certified Copy) bearing SANAS logo. QMEs/EMEs: Sworn affidavit / CIPC confirmation of turnover etc.		
Central Suppliers Database Registration Report Attached – Not older than 30 days NB: Only suppliers registered on CSD may bid.		
Additional documentation required for certain types of bids. If applicable the additional documents will be distributed as part of the tender / bid documentation	Check Bidder	Verified SCM Unit
Declaration certificate for local production and content for designated sectors (SBD 6.2)		

Declaration			
<ul style="list-style-type: none">I have read and agree to the General Conditions of Contract related to Government procurement (Available on DPME tenders web page or from National Treasury)I have read the DPME standard Service Level Agreement (SLA) and have included in my (our) proposal and material changes that may be required to the SLA.I have completed and submitted all the documents indicated in the above checklistI have read and agree with the terms and conditions applicable to all bids as stipulated in this documentI have noted and will comply with the delivery time frames indicated in the specifications / terms of ReferenceI am the authorised signatory of the applicantFor the purposes of section 256 of the Tax Administration Act of 2011 I authorise the South African Revenue Service to disclose "taxpayer information" as contemplated under the provisions of Chapter 6 of the Act in relation to the compliance status of tax registration, tax debt and filing requirements to the Department of Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation.			
Signature		Date	
Name of Signatory			
Designation of Signatory			
Name of bidder (if different)			

TERMS AND CONDITIONS APPLICABLE TO ALL BIDS

ALL DPME BID DOCUMENTS ARE AVAILABLE FREE OF CHARGE FROM THE DPME WEBSITE OR DPME OFFICES AND MAY THEREFORE NOT BE SOLD

1. GENERAL

This request is issued in terms of the Public Finance Management Act (Act 1 of 1999) as amended (PFMA), Treasury Regulations, the Preferential Procurement Policy Framework Act 5 of 2000 (PPPFA), the Preferential Procurement Regulations, 2017 (PPR), Supply Chain Management instructions issued by the National Treasury, General Conditions of Contract published by National Treasury (GCC), the B-BBEE Act (Act 53 of 2003) as well as applicable Departmental Policies.

- Lead times / delivery periods should be clearly indicated in the quotation / proposal where applicable. The Department reserves the right to cancel any order where the delivery period indicated in the quotation / proposal is extended.
- The Department reserves the right to require delivery of the goods as specified, at the price quoted, regardless of any differences in specifications contained in the quotation.
- The department reserves the right NOT to appoint any Service Provider or to withdraw this request for bids/proposals.
- The department reserves the right to split the award of the bid between two or more Service Providers or to award only a part of the bid.
- The Department reserves the right to call bidders that meet the minimum functional requirements to present their proposals. The Bid Evaluation Committee may decide to amend the scoring assigned to a particular bid based on the presentation made.

2. TAX COMPLIANCE REQUIREMENTS

- 2.1. Bidders must ensure compliance with their tax obligations.
- 2.2. Bidders are required to submit their unique personal identification number (pin) issued by SARS to enable the Department to view the taxpayer's profile and tax status.
- 2.3. Application for the tax compliance status (TCS) certificate or pin may also be made via e-filing. In order to use this provision, taxpayers will need to register with SARS as e-filers through the website www.sars.gov.za.
- 2.4. The tax compliance requirements are not applicable to foreign bidders / individuals with no South African tax obligation, no history of doing business in South Africa. Foreign suppliers must complete a pre-award questionnaire from SARS on their tax obligation categorisation.
- 2.5. Bidders may also submit an original printed TCS certificate together with the bid.
- 2.6. In bids where consortia / joint ventures / sub-contractors are involved, each party must submit a separate TCS certificate / pin / CSD number.
- 2.7. Where no TCS is available but the bidder is registered on the central supplier database (CSD), a CSD number must be provided.

3. ADMINISTRATIVE COMPLIANCE

Only proposals that comply with all administrative requirements (including tax compliance requirements) will be considered acceptable for further evaluation. Incomplete and late bids may be rejected. All documents indicated on page 1 must be submitted with each bid. Bidders must use the Standards Bid Documents (SBDs) included in this document (documents may not be re-typed)

All quoted prices should be valid (firm) for at least 120 days from the closing date indicated on SBD 1 and must be **inclusive of VAT**. Prices dependent on the **exchange rate** should include reference to the exchange rate used. Price escalations and the conditions of escalation should be clearly indicated. No variation of contract price or scope creep will be permitted unless specifically allowed in the ToR.

4. FUNCTIONAL EVALUATION

Functional criteria and/or specifications are contained in the specifications sheet or Terms of Reference. Unless otherwise indicated in the ToR, only service providers that submitted acceptable bids and that scored at least the minimum for each functional criteria as well as the overall minimum score (75%) will proceed to the PPPFA evaluation phase.

TERMS AND CONDITIONS APPLICABLE TO ALL BIDS

5. PRICE EVALUATION: THE PPPFA

Only bids that meet the minimum functional requirements / specifications indicated in the ToR will be evaluated in terms of the Preferential Procurement Framework Act and related regulations. Points will be awarded to a bidder for attaining the B-BBEE status level of contribution in accordance with the table contained in SBD 6.1. The applicable evaluation method is indicated in SBD 6.1.

Consortia or joint ventures must take note of SBD 6.1, paragraphs 5.4 and 5.5 regarding requirements for B-BBEE certificates.

If the 80/20 preference point system is specified on SBD 6.1 and all bids received exceed R50,000,000, the bid will be evaluated on the 90/10 preference point system.

6. REJECTION OF QUOTES / PROPOSALS

Any effort by a bidder to influence the evaluation, comparisons or award decisions in any manner, may result in rejection of the quote / proposal concerned. DPME shall reject a quote / proposal if the bidder has committed a proven corrupt or fraudulent act in competing for a particular contract. DPME may disregard any quote / proposal if the bidder or any of its subcontractors:

- a) Is not tax compliant
- b) Have abused the Supply Chain Management (SCM) system of the Department or any other government department.
- c) Have committed proven fraud or any other improper conduct in relation to such system.
- d) Have failed to perform on any previous contract.
- e) Supplied incorrect information in the bid documentation.

7. VETTING

The Department reserves the right to approach the relevant authorities to verify the following for each bidder:

- Citizenship status (individuals)
- Company information
- Criminal records (individuals)
- Previous tender and government contract track records
- Government employment status (individuals)
- Company / closed corporation ownership / membership status (individuals)
- Suitability to handle confidential government information
- Qualifications of bidders / contractors / team members
- Any other information contained in bid documents

8. REGISTRATION ON DPME SUPPLIERS DATABASE

If not already registered, the successful bidder will be registered on the DPME suppliers database. The following terms and conditions apply:

- 8.1. All suppliers must be registered on the central suppliers database managed by National Treasury (www.csd.gov.za) before they can register on the DPME suppliers database.
- 8.2. All information will be treated confidentially.
- 8.3. Applications that are incomplete or that are not accompanied by the required documents will be disqualified. The included checklist should be completed to ensure completeness of the application.
- 8.4. Completed application forms should be posted to or hand delivered at the above mentioned addresses. No e-mail or fax copies can be accepted
- 8.5. The Department of Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation's (DPME) Service Provider Database will be used mainly for the purposes of identifying entities (individuals or juristic persons) when price quotations for

TERMS AND CONDITIONS APPLICABLE TO ALL BIDS

goods and services are to be invited. Requests for quotations / proposals are normally sent by e-mail to the address provided on the supplier registration form. The fact that an entity is registered as a supplier does not constitute any contractual relationship between the entity and the Department of Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation.

- 8.6. Suppliers may list a maximum of 5 categories of goods and services offered (Section 4). Where a supplier lists more than 5 categories, the DPME may at its own discretion reject the application or select the 5 most applicable categories.
- 8.7. For procurement above the financial limit applicable to price quotations, as determined from time to time by National Treasury, the DPME will normally invite competitive bids by means of advertisements in the Government Tender Bulletin. The onus is on entities to monitor the tender bulletin and to ensure that they obtain copies of the bidding documents that are available on the DPME when bids are advertised.
- 8.8. The Department reserves the right to approach potential service providers not on the database in cases where an insufficient number of suppliers are registered for a particular commodity or service or an insufficient number of quotations are received in response to a particular request for quotations or proposals.
- 8.9. It is the responsibility of a registered entity to inform the DPME immediately in writing of any changes in the particulars as stated in the application, especially changes in respect of contact details, ownership, B-BBEE and the SMME or EME status of the entity. Should a contract be awarded to an entity based on incorrect particulars provided by that entity, the DPME shall have the right to, in addition to any other remedy that it may have in terms of applicable legislation, cancel the contract and to claim damages.
- 8.10. The DPME reserves the right to cancel the registration of an entity if that entity has given incorrect or false information in the application form or any correspondence relating to the application or:
 - Failed to inform the Department of any changes to the particulars as furnished in the application;
 - Failed to comply with the conditions of any contract that might have been awarded to the entity;
 - The entity has been included on the list of restricted suppliers maintained by National Treasury; or
 - The entity has acted in an improper, fraudulent or corrupt manner.
- 8.11. The DPME reserves the right to cancel the registration of an entity if that entity fails to respond to three or more consecutive requests for quotations / proposals.
- 8.12. The following documentation must accompany this application:
 - All documents included in this application form.
 - Original or certified copy of a valid B-BBEE Status level certificate (must bear SANAS logo), or sworn affidavit in cases of EMEs.
 - Printout from Central Suppliers Database (www.csd.gov.za) with supplier unique registration reference.
- 8.13. For the purposes of section 256 of the Tax Administration Act of 2011 the bidder / supplier authorises the South African Revenue Service to disclose "taxpayer information" as contemplated under the provisions of Chapter 6 of the Act in relation to the compliance status of tax registration, tax debt and filing requirements to the Department of Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation.

INVITATION TO BID (SBD 1)

**YOU ARE HEREBY INVITED TO BID FOR REQUIREMENTS OF THE
DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING, MONITORING AND EVALUATION**
(Subject to the terms and conditions applicable to all bids as indicated earlier in this bid document)

BID NUMBER	DPME 06-2017/18	CLOSING DATE	28 July 2017	CLOSING TIME	12:00
COMPULSORY BRIEFING SESSION	Date		13 July 2017	Time	10:00
DESCRIPTION	IMPLEMENTATION EVALUATION OF THE LEARNER TRANSPORT PROGRAMME				
BID DOCUMENTS MAY BE POSTED TO: Department of Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation Head: Procurement Services Private Bag X944, PRETORIA, 0001			OR DEPOSITED IN THE BID BOX SITUATED AT (STREET ADDRESS): 330 Grosvenor Street, Hatfield, Pretoria <i>The bid box is accessible on working days between 8:00 and 17:00.</i>		
SUPPLIER INFORMATION					
Name of bidder					
Postal address					
Street address					
Telephone number			Cell phone number		
E-mail address					
Company Reg. #			Vat registration #		
Tax compliance status	Compliant		CSD #		
	Not compliant		TCS Pin (if no CSD #)		
B-BBEE Status Level verification	None				
	All except EMEs: Certificate Issued by verification agency accredited by the SANAS				
	EMEs: Sworn affidavit by EME representative and attested to by Commissioner of oaths				

Are you the accredited representative in South Africa for the goods /services /works offered? If yes attach proof	YES	NO
FOREIGN SUPPLIERS: Do not complete this form. You must contact the Department to obtain the required documentation to be completed		

Total bid price (Incl. VAT)		Total # of items offered	
------------------------------------	--	---------------------------------	--

Signature (Attach proof of authority to sign this bid; e.g. resolution of directors, etc.)		Date	
Name of Signatory			
Designation of Signatory			
Name of bidder (if different)			

ANY ENQUIRIES REGARDING THE BIDDING PROCEDURE MAY BE DIRECTED TO:
Contact persons indicated on the bid documents; or
Head of Procurement Services, 330 Grosvenor Street, Hatfield, Pretoria. Tel 012 312 0000

DECLARATION OF INTEREST (SBD 4)

Any legal person, including persons employed by the state¹, or persons having a kinship with persons employed by the state, including a blood relationship, may make an offer or offers in terms of an invitation to bid (includes a price quotation, advertised competitive bid, limited bid or proposal). In view of possible allegations of favouritism, should the resulting bid, or part thereof, be awarded to persons employed by the state, or to persons connected with or related to them, it is required that the bidder or his/her authorised representative declare his/her position in relation to the evaluating/adjudicating authority where:

- the bidder is employed by the state; and/or
- the legal person on whose behalf the bidding document is signed, has a relationship with persons/a person who are/is involved in the evaluation and or adjudication of the bid(s), or where it is known that such a relationship exists between the person or persons for or on whose behalf the declarant acts and persons who are involved with the evaluation and or adjudication of the bid.

In order to give effect to the above, the following questionnaire must be completed and submitted.

1.1 Full Name of bidder or his or her representative:

1.2 Identity Number:

1.3 Position occupied in Company (director, trustee, shareholder², member):

1.3.1 The names of all directors / trustees / shareholders / members, their individual identity numbers, tax reference numbers and, if applicable, employee / PERSAL numbers must be indicated in paragraph 2 below.

1.4 Are you or any person connected with the bidder presently employed by the state? YES NO

1.4.1 If so, furnish the following particulars:

Name of person / director / trustee / shareholder/ member

Name of state institution at which you or the person connected to the bidder is employed:

Position occupied in the state institution:

Any other particulars:

1.4.2 If you are presently employed by the state, did you obtain the appropriate authority to undertake remunerative work outside employment in the public sector? YES NO

1.4.2.1 If yes, did you attached proof of such authority to the bid document? YES NO

(Note: Failure to submit proof of such authority, where applicable, may result in the disqualification of the bid.

1.4.2.2 If no, furnish reasons for non-submission of such proof:

¹ State" means –

- (a) any national or provincial department, national or provincial public entity or constitutional institution within the meaning of the Public Finance Management Act, 1999 (Act No. 1 of 1999);
- (b) any municipality or municipal entity;
- (c) provincial legislature;
- (d) national Assembly or the national Council of provinces; or
- (e) Parliament.

² "Shareholder" means a person who owns shares in the company and is actively involved in the management of the enterprise or business and exercises control over the enterprise.

DECLARATION OF INTEREST (SBD 4)

1.5 Did you or your spouse, or any of the company’s directors /trustees / shareholders / members or their spouses conduct business with the state in the previous twelve months? YES NO

1.5.1 If so, furnish particulars:

1.6 Do you, or any person connected with the bidder, have any relationship (family, friend, other) with a person employed by the state and who may be involved with the evaluation and or adjudication of this bid? YES NO

1.6.1 If so, furnish particulars:

1.7 Are you, or any person connected with the bidder, aware of any relationship (family, friend, other) between any other bidder and any person employed by the state who may be involved with the evaluation and or adjudication of this bid? YES NO

1.7.1 If so, furnish particulars:

1.8 Do you or any of the directors / trustees / shareholders / members of the company have any interest in any other related companies whether or not they are bidding for this contract? YES NO

1.8.1 If so, furnish particulars:

2. Full details of directors / trustees / members / shareholders.

See CSD report

3. DECLARATION

I, THE UNDERSIGNED CERTIFY THAT THE INFORMATION FURNISHED ABOVE IS CORRECT. I ACCEPT THAT THE STATE MAY REJECT THE BID OR ACT AGAINST ME SHOULD THIS DECLARATION PROVE TO BE FALSE.

Signature		Date	
Name of Signatory			
Designation of Signatory			
Name of bidder (if different)			

PREFERENCE POINTS CLAIM (SBD 6.1)

PREFERENCE POINTS CLAIM FORM IN TERMS OF THE PREFERENTIAL PROCUREMENT REGULATIONS 2017

This preference form must form part of all bids invited. It contains general information and serves as a claim form for preference points for Broad-Based Black Economic Empowerment (B-BBEE) Status Level of Contribution

NB: BEFORE COMPLETING THIS FORM, BIDDERS MUST STUDY THE GENERAL CONDITIONS, DEFINITIONS AND DIRECTIVES APPLICABLE IN RESPECT OF B-BBEE, AS PRESCRIBED IN THE PREFERENTIAL PROCUREMENT REGULATIONS, 2017.

1. GENERAL CONDITIONS

- 1.1 The following preference point systems are applicable to all bids:
- the 80/20 system for requirements with a Rand value of up to R50,000,000 (all applicable taxes included); and
 - the 90/10 system for requirements with a Rand value above R50,000,000 (all applicable taxes included).

- 1.2 The value of this bid is estimated to ~~exceed~~/not exceed R50,000,000 (all applicable taxes included) and therefore the 80/20 system shall be applicable. Preference points for this bid shall be awarded for:

(a) Price; and	80
(b) B-BBEE Status Level of Contribution.	20
TOTAL	100

- 1.3 Failure on the part of a bidder to submit a B-BBEE Verification Certificate from a Verification Agency accredited by the South African Accreditation System (SANAS), or a sworn affidavit confirming annual turnover and level of black ownership in case of an EME together with the bid, will be interpreted to mean that preference points for B-BBEE status level of contribution are not claimed.
- 1.4. The purchaser reserves the right to require of a bidder, either before a bid is adjudicated or at any time subsequently, to substantiate any claim in regard to preferences, in any manner required by the purchaser.

2. DEFINITIONS

- 2.1 “**B-BBEE**” means broad-based black economic empowerment as defined in section 1 of the Broad-Based Black Economic Empowerment Act;
- 2.2 “**B-BBEE status level of contributor**” means the B-BBEE status of an entity in terms of a code of good practice on black economic empowerment, issued in terms of section 9(1) of the Broad-Based Black Economic Empowerment Act;
- 2.3 “**bid**” means a written offer in a prescribed or stipulated form in response to an invitation by an organ of state for the provision of services, works or goods, through price quotations, advertised competitive bidding processes or proposals;
- 2.4 “**Broad-Based Black Economic Empowerment Act**” means the Broad-Based Black Economic Empowerment Act, 2003 (Act No. 53 of 2003);
- 2.5 “**EME**” means an Exempted Micro Enterprise as defines by Codes of Good Practice under section 9 (1) of the Broad-Based Black Economic Empowerment Act with an annual turnover up to R10 million;
- 2.6 “**functionality**” means the ability of a tenderer to provide goods or services in accordance with specifications as set out in the tender documents;
- 2.7 “**proof of B-BBEE status level of contributor**” means:
- 1) B-BBEE Status level certificate issued by an authorized body or person;
 - 2) A sworn affidavit as prescribed by the B-BBEE Codes of Good Practice;
 - 3) Any other requirement prescribed in terms of the B-BBEE Act;

PREFERENCE POINTS CLAIM (SBD 6.1)

- 2.8 “prices” includes all applicable taxes less all unconditional discounts;
- 2.9 “QSE” means a qualifying small business enterprise in terms of a code of good practice on black economic empowerment issued in terms of section 9 (1) of the Broad-Based Black Economic Empowerment Act);
- 2.10 “rand value” means the total estimated value of a contract in Rand, calculated at the time of bid invitation, and includes all applicable taxes;

3. POINTS AWARDED FOR PRICE: THE 80/20 OR 90/10 PREFERENCE POINT SYSTEMS

A maximum of 80 or 90 points are allocated for price on the following basis:

$$\begin{array}{l}
 \mathbf{80/20 \text{ (Up to R50,000,000)}} \quad \mathbf{Or} \quad \mathbf{90/10 \text{ (From R50,000,000)}} \\
 P_s = 80 \left(1 - \frac{P_t - P_{\min}}{P_{\min}} \right) \quad \mathbf{Or} \quad P_s = 90 \left(1 - \frac{P_t - P_{\min}}{P_{\min}} \right)
 \end{array}$$

Where:

- Ps = Points scored for comparative price of bid under consideration
- Pt = Comparative price of bid under consideration
- Pmin = Comparative price of lowest acceptable bid

4. POINTS AWARDED FOR B-BBEE STATUS LEVEL OF CONTRIBUTION

- 4.1 In terms of Regulation 6 (2) and 7 (2) of the Preferential Procurement Regulations, preference points must be awarded to a bidder for attaining the B-BBEE status level of contribution in accordance with the table below:

B-BBEE Status Level of Contributor	Number of points (90/10 system)	Number of points (80/20 system)
1	10	20
2	9	18
3	6	14
4	5	12
5	4	8
6	3	6
7	2	4
8	1	2
Non-compliant contributor	0	0

- 4.2 A bidder who qualifies as a EME in terms of the B-BBEE Act must submit a sworn affidavit confirming Annual Total Revenue and Level of Black Ownership. An EME automatically qualifies as a level 4 contributor. An EME with at least 75% black ownership qualifies as level 1 contributor and an EME with black ownership from 51% to 74% qualifies as a level 2 contributor.
- 4.3 A Bidder other than EME must submit their original and valid B-BBEE status level verification certificate or a certified copy thereof, substantiating their B-BBEE rating. The certificate must be issued by a Verification Agency accredited by SANAS.

5. BID DECLARATION

Bidders who claim points in respect of B-BBEE Status Level of Contribution must complete the following:

6. B-BBEE STATUS LEVEL OF CONTRIBUTION CLAIMED IN TERMS OF PARAGRAPHS 1.3 AND 5.1

B-BBEE Status Level of Contribution: = (maximum of 10 or 20 points)

(Points claimed in respect of paragraph 6 must be in accordance with the table reflected in paragraph 4.1 and must be substantiated by relevant proof of B-BBEE status level of contributor.

PREFERENCE POINTS CLAIM (SBD 6.1)

7. SUB-CONTRACTING

Will any portion of the contract be sub-contracted? YES / NO (delete which is not applicable). If yes, indicate:

- (I) (what percentage of the contract will be subcontracted?%)
- (II) the name of the sub-contractor?
- (III) the B-BBEE status level of the sub-contractor?
- (IV) whether the sub-contractor is an EME or QSE? YES / NO (delete which is not applicable)
- (V) Specify, by ticking the appropriate box, if subcontracting with an enterprise in terms of Preferential Procurement Regulations, 2017:

Designated Group: An EME or QSE which is at last 51% owned by:	EME ✓	QSE ✓
Black people		
Black people who are youth		
Black people who are women		
Black people with disabilities		
Black people living in rural or underdeveloped areas or townships		
Cooperative owned by black people		
Black people who are military veterans		
OR		
Any EME		
Any QSE		

8. DECLARATION WITH REGARD TO COMPANY/FIRM

I/we, the undersigned, who is / are duly authorised to do so on behalf of the company/firm, certify that the points claimed, based on the B-BBEE status level of contributor indicated in paragraph 6 of the foregoing certificate, qualifies the company/ firm for the preference(s) shown and I / we acknowledge that:

- (I) The information furnished (including informational SBD 1) is true and correct;
- (II) The preference points claimed are in accordance with the General Conditions as indicated in paragraph 1 of this form.
- (III) In the event of a contract being awarded as a result of points claimed as shown in paragraph 6, the contractor may be required to furnish documentary proof to the satisfaction of the purchaser that the claims are correct;
- (IV) If the B-BBEE status level of contribution has been claimed or obtained on a fraudulent basis or any of the conditions of contract have not been fulfilled, the purchaser may, in addition to any other remedy it may have –
 - (a) disqualify the person from the bidding process;
 - (b) recover costs, losses or damages it has incurred or suffered as a result of that person’s conduct;
 - (c) cancel the contract and claim any damages which it has suffered as a result of having to make less favourable arrangements due to such cancellation;
 - (d) restrict the bidder or contractor, its shareholders and directors, or only the shareholders and directors who acted on a fraudulent basis, from obtaining business from any organ of state for a period not exceeding 10 years, after the audi alteram partem (hear the other side) rule has been applied; and
 - (e) forward the matter for criminal prosecution

Signature		Date	
Name of Signatory			
Designation of Signatory			
Name of bidder (if different)			

DECLARATION OF PAST SUPPLY CHAIN MANAGEMENT PRACTICES (SBD 8)

1. This Standard Bidding Document must form part of all bids invited.
2. It serves as a declaration to be used by institutions in ensuring that when goods and services are being procured, all reasonable steps are taken to combat the abuse of the supply chain management system.
3. The bid of any bidder may be disregarded if that bidder, or any of its directors have-
 - a. abused the institution's supply chain management system;
 - b. committed fraud or any other improper conduct in relation to such system; or
 - c. failed to perform on any previous contract.
4. In order to give effect to the above, the following questionnaire must be completed and submitted with the bid.

Item	Question	Yes	No
4.1	Is the bidder or any of its directors listed on the National Treasury's database as companies or persons prohibited from doing business with the public sector? (Companies or persons who are listed on this database were informed in writing of this restriction by the National Treasury after the <i>audi alteram partem</i> rule was applied)	Yes	No
4.1.1	If so, furnish particulars:		
4.2	Is the bidder or any of its directors listed on the Register for Tender Defaulters in terms of section 29 of the Prevention and Combating of Corrupt Activities Act (No 12 of 2004)? (To access this Register enter the National Treasury's website, www.treasury.gov.za, click on the icon "Register for Tender Defaulters" or submit your written request for a hard copy of the Register to facsimile number (012) 3265445.	Yes	No
4.2.1	If so, furnish particulars:		
4.3	Was the bidder or any of its directors convicted by a court of law (including a court outside of the Republic of South Africa) for fraud or corruption during the past five years?	Yes	No
4.3.1	If so, furnish particulars:		
4.4	Was any contract between the bidder and any organ of state terminated during the past five years on account of failure to perform on or comply with the contract?	Yes	No
4.4.1	If so, furnish particulars:		

CERTIFICATION

I, THE UNDERSIGNED CERTIFY THAT THE INFORMATION FURNISHED ON THIS DECLARATION FORM IS TRUE AND CORRECT.

I ACCEPT THAT, IN ADDITION TO CANCELLATION OF A CONTRACT, ACTION MAY BE TAKEN AGAINST ME SHOULD THIS DECLARATION PROVE TO BE FALSE.

Signature		Date	
Name of Signatory			
Designation of Signatory			
Name of bidder (if different)			

CERTIFICATE OF INDEPENDENT BID DETERMINATION (SBD 9)

- 1 This Standard Bidding Document (SBD) must form part of all bids¹ invited.
- 2 Section 4 (1) (b) (iii) of the Competition Act No. 89 of 1998, as amended, prohibits an agreement between, or concerted practice by, firms, or a decision by an association of firms, if it is between parties in a horizontal relationship and if it involves collusive bidding (or bid rigging).² Collusive bidding is a *pe se* prohibition meaning that it cannot be justified under any grounds.
- 3 Treasury Regulation 16A9 prescribes that accounting officers and accounting authorities must take all reasonable steps to prevent abuse of the supply chain management system and authorizes accounting officers and accounting authorities to:
 - (a) disregard the bid of any bidder if that bidder, or any of its directors have abused the institution’s supply chain management system and or committed fraud or any other improper conduct in relation to such system.
 - (b) cancel a contract awarded to a supplier of goods and services if the supplier committed any corrupt or fraudulent act during the bidding process or the execution of that contract.
- 4 This SBD serves as a certificate of declaration that would be used by institutions to ensure that, when bids are considered, reasonable steps are taken to prevent any form of bid-rigging.
- 5 In order to give effect to the above, the attached Certificate of Bid Determination (SBD 9) must be completed and submitted with the bid:

¹ Includes price quotations, advertised competitive bids, limited bids and proposals.

² Bid rigging (or collusive bidding) occurs when businesses, that would otherwise be expected to compete, secretly conspire to raise prices or lower the quality of goods and / or services for purchasers who wish to acquire goods and / or services through a bidding process. Bid rigging is, therefore, an agreement between competitors not to compete.

I, the undersigned, in submitting the accompanying bid:

(Bid Number and Description)

in response to the invitation for the bid made by:

The Department of Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation

(Name of Institution)

do hereby make the following statements that I certify to be true and complete in every respect:

I certify, on behalf of: _____ that:
align="center">(Name of Bidder)

1. I have read and I understand the contents of this Certificate;
2. I understand that the accompanying bid will be disqualified if this Certificate is found not to be true and complete in every respect;
3. I am authorised by the bidder to sign this Certificate, and to submit the accompanying bid, on behalf of the bidder;
4. Each person whose signature appears on the accompanying bid has been authorised by the bidder to determine the terms of, and to sign the bid, on behalf of the bidder;
5. For the purposes of this Certificate and the accompanying bid, I understand that the word “competitor” shall include any individual or organization, other than the bidder, whether or not affiliated with the bidder, who:
 - (a) has been requested to submit a bid in response to this bid invitation;
 - (b) could potentially submit a bid in response to this bid invitation, based on their qualifications, abilities or experience; and
 - (c) provides the same goods and services as the bidder and/or is in the same line of business as the bidder

CERTIFICATE OF INDEPENDENT BID DETERMINATION (SBD 9)

6. The bidder has arrived at the accompanying bid independently from, and without consultation, communication, agreement or arrangement with any competitor. However communication between partners in a joint venture or consortium³ will not be construed as collusive bidding.
7. In particular, without limiting the generality of paragraphs 6 above, there has been no consultation, communication, agreement or arrangement with any competitor regarding:
 - (a) prices;
 - (b) geographical area where product or service will be rendered (market allocation)
 - (c) methods, factors or formulas used to calculate prices;
 - (d) the intention or decision to submit or not to submit, a bid;
 - (e) the submission of a bid which does not meet the specifications and conditions of the bid; or
 - (f) bidding with the intention not to win the bid.
8. In addition, there have been no consultations, communications, agreements or arrangements with any competitor regarding the quality, quantity, specifications and conditions or delivery particulars of the products or services to which this bid invitation relates.
9. The terms of the accompanying bid have not been, and will not be, disclosed by the bidder, directly or indirectly, to any competitor, prior to the date and time of the official bid opening or of the awarding of the contract.
10. I am aware that, in addition and without prejudice to any other remedy provided to combat any restrictive practices related to bids and contracts, bids that are suspicious will be reported to the Competition Commission for investigation and possible imposition of administrative penalties in terms of section 59 of the Competition Act No 89 of 1998 and or may be reported to the National Prosecuting Authority (NPA) for criminal investigation and or may be restricted from conducting business with the public sector for a period not exceeding ten (10) years in terms of the Prevention and Combating of Corrupt Activities Act No 12 of 2004 or any other applicable legislation.

Signature		Date	
Name of Signatory			
Designation of Signatory			
Name of bidder (if different)			

³ *Joint venture or Consortium means an association of persons for the purpose of combining their expertise, property, capital, efforts, skill and knowledge in an activity for the execution of a contract.*